

Inverse Limits and Function Algebras*

Joan E. Hart[†] and Kenneth Kunen^{‡§}

February 1, 2008

Abstract

Assuming Jensen's principle $\diamond$, there is a compact Hausdorff space X which is hereditarily Lindelöf, hereditarily separable, and connected, such that no closed subspace of X is both perfect and totally disconnected. The Proper Forcing Axiom implies that there is no such space. The $\diamond$ example also fails to satisfy the CSWP (the complex version of the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem). This space cannot contain the two earlier examples of failure of the CSWP, which were totally disconnected — specifically, the Cantor set (W. Rudin) and $\beta\mathbb{N}$ (Hoffman and Singer).

1 Introduction

All topologies discussed in this paper are assumed to be Hausdorff. It is well-known that if X is compact and second countable and not scattered, then X has a subspace homeomorphic to the usual Cantor set, 2^ω . This is not true of non-second countable spaces. For example, the double arrow space of Alexandroff and Urysohn [1] is compact and not scattered, but is only first countable and does not contain a Cantor subset.

The double arrow space is also HS (hereditarily separable) and HL (hereditarily Lindelöf); that is, all subspaces are both separable and Lindelöf (see [4] Exercise 3.10.C). It is also a LOTS; that is, a totally ordered set with its order topology. The double arrow space is also totally disconnected, and it is natural to ask whether there is a connected version of it. This turns out to be independent of ZFC. Under the Proper Forcing Axiom (PFA), there is no such space:

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 54D05, 46J10. Key Words and Phrases: hereditarily Lindelöf, hereditarily separable, function algebra.

[†]University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, WI 54901, U.S.A., hartj@uwosh.edu

[‡]University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, U.S.A., kunen@math.wisc.edu

[§]Both authors partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-0097881.

Theorem 1.1 *Assuming PFA, every compact HL space is either totally disconnected or contains a copy of the Cantor set.*

On the other hand, by Theorem 1.3, there will be such a space assuming Jensen's principle $\diamond$, which is true in Gödel's universe of constructible sets.

Definition 1.2 *A space X is weird iff X is compact and not scattered, and there is no $P \subseteq X$ such that P is perfect and totally disconnected.*

So, X cannot be second countable. However,

Theorem 1.3 *Assuming $\diamond$, there is a weird X such that X is HS and HL.*

Note that a compact X is HL iff every closed set is a G_δ (see [4] Exercise 3.8.A(c)). Applying this to the points, we see that X must be first countable.

We can also get our X to fail the complex version of the *Stone-Weierstrass Theorem*. This theorem involves subalgebras of $C(X, \mathbb{R})$, and is true for all compact X . If one replaces the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$ by the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$, the “theorem” is true for some X and false for others, so it becomes a *property* of X :

Definition 1.4 *If X is compact, then $C(X) = C(X, \mathbb{C})$ is the algebra of continuous complex-valued functions on X , with the usual supremum norm. $\mathcal{A} \subseteq C(X)$ means that $\mathcal{A}$ is a subalgebra of $C(X)$ which separates points and contains the constant functions. $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq C(X)$ means that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq C(X)$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is closed in $C(X)$. X has the Complex Stone-Weierstrass Property (CSWP) iff every $\mathcal{A} \subseteq C(X)$ is dense in $C(X)$.*

Classical examples from the 1800s show that the CSWP is false for many X . In particular:

Definition 1.5 *D denotes the open unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbb{T}$ denotes the unit circle. The disc algebra $\mathfrak{D} \sqsubseteq C(\overline{D})$ is the set of $f \in C(\overline{D})$ which are holomorphic on D .*

Then $\mathfrak{D}$ refutes the CSWP of $\overline{D}$, and $\mathfrak{D} \restriction \mathbb{T} = \{f \restriction \mathbb{T} : f \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ refutes the CSWP of $\mathbb{T}$. Further negative results were obtained in 1956 by Rudin [12] and in 1960 by Hoffman and Singer [9] (see also [8]):

1. [12] Every compact X containing a copy of the Cantor set fails the CSWP.
2. [9] Every compact X containing a copy of $\beta\mathbb{N}$ fails the CSWP.

Actually, [9] does not mention $\beta\mathbb{N}$, and used instead S = the Stone space of a separable measure algebra, but that is equivalent, since each of S and $\beta\mathbb{N}$ contains a copy of the other. The first non-trivial positive result is due to Rudin [13], and some more recent positive results are contained in [7, 10]. In particular,

3. [13] Every compact scattered space satisfies the CSWP.
4. [10] Every compact LOTS which does not contain a copy of the Cantor satisfies the CSWP.

By (4), the double arrow space is an example of a non-scattered space which has the CSWP. Results (1) through (4) might suggest the (highly unlikely) conjecture that a compact X has the CSWP whenever it contains neither $\beta\mathbb{N}$ nor a Cantor set. Under $\diamond$, this is refuted by:

Theorem 1.6 *Assuming $\diamond$, there is a weird X such that X is HS and HL and X fails the CSWP.*

As Rudin pointed out, (1)(3) imply that for X compact metric, X has the CSWP iff X does not contain a Cantor subset. By (1)(4), the same “iff” holds when X is a compact LOTS. By (2), the “iff” does not hold for arbitrary compact spaces, but one might hope to prove it for some other spaces which are small in some way. Theorem 1.6 puts some bounds on this hope.

Obviously, Theorem 1.6 implies Theorem 1.3, but we shall prove Theorem 1.3 first. We then explain what needs to be added to the construction to obtain Theorem 1.6. Both proofs are essentially inverse limit constructions. For Theorem 1.3, we obtain $X \subset [0, 1]^{\omega_1}$ by an inductive construction; at stage $\alpha < \omega_1$, we determine the projection, X_α , of X on $[0, 1]^\alpha$. Then, X may be viewed as the inverse limit of $\langle X_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$. For Theorem 1.6, we replace $[0, 1]$ by $\overline{D}$.

Theorem 1.3 is proved in Section 2, which also gives some more information about weird spaces. Theorem 1.6 is proved in Section 4, using a fact about peak points proved in Section 3. Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 5, which may be read immediately after Section 2.

2 Weird Spaces

We list some easy properties of weird spaces:

Definition 2.1 $\text{comp}(x, X)$ denotes the connected component of the point x in the space X .

Lemma 2.2 *If X is weird then:*

1. *If $Y \subseteq X$ and Y is closed, then Y is either scattered or weird.*
2. *For some $x \in X$: $\text{comp}(x, X)$ is not a singleton, so that $\text{comp}(x, X)$ is weird and connected.*
3. *X is not second countable.*
4. *X is not a LOTS.*

Proof. For (4), if X is a LOTS, let $S \subset X$ be countable and order-isomorphic to the rationals. Since $\overline{S}$ cannot be totally disconnected, it contains an interval isomorphic to the unit interval in $\mathbb{R}$, contradicting (1) and (3). ☺

We shall see that no subspace of a countable product of LOTS can be weird either. First:

Lemma 2.3 *If X is weird and f maps X continuously onto Y , then either Y is weird or some $f^{-1}\{y\}$ is weird.*

Proof. Assume no $f^{-1}\{y\}$ is weird. Then each $f^{-1}\{y\}$ is scattered.

Note that Y cannot be scattered. To see this, let K be the perfect kernel of X . If y is an isolated point of $f(K)$, then $K \cap f^{-1}\{y\}$ is scattered and clopen in K , a contradiction.

If Y is not weird, fix $P \subseteq Y$ such that P is perfect and totally disconnected. Then for $x \in f^{-1}(P)$, $\text{comp}(x, f^{-1}(P)) \subseteq f^{-1}\{f(x)\}$, which is scattered, so $\text{comp}(x, f^{-1}(P)) = \{x\}$. Thus, $f^{-1}(P)$ is totally disconnected, and hence scattered (since X is weird), which is a contradiction, since $P = f(f^{-1}(P))$ is not scattered. ☺

Corollary 2.4 *Suppose that X is weird and $X \subseteq \prod_{j < n} Z_j$, where n is finite and each Z_j is compact. Then some Z_j has a weird subspace.*

Proof. Induct on n , using Lemma 2.3. ☺

We now prove the same result for countable products. First, we introduce some notation for products and projections:

Definition 2.5 *If Z_ξ are spaces for $\xi < \beta$ then $\pi_\alpha^\beta : \prod_{\xi < \beta} Z_\xi \twoheadrightarrow \prod_{\xi < \alpha} Z_\xi$ (for $\alpha \leq \beta$) and then $\varphi_\alpha^\beta : \prod_{\xi < \beta} Z_\xi \rightarrow Z_\alpha$ (for $\alpha < \beta$) are the natural projections. If $\vec{z} = \langle z_\xi : \xi < \beta \rangle \in \prod_{\xi < \beta} Z_\xi$, then $\varphi_\alpha^\beta(\vec{z}) = z_\alpha$ and $\pi_\alpha^\beta(\vec{z}) = \langle z_\xi : \xi < \alpha \rangle$. We sometimes write φ_α for φ_α^β when β is clear from context.*

Lemma 2.6 *Suppose that X is weird and $X \subseteq \prod_{j < \omega} Z_j$, where each Z_j is compact. Then some Z_j has a weird subspace.*

Proof. Assume that no Z_j has a weird subspace; we shall derive a contradiction.

Let $X_n = \pi_n^\omega(X) \subseteq \prod_{j < n} Z_j$. By Corollary 2.4, no X_n has a weird subspace.

View $\bigcup_n X_n$ as a tree, where X_n is the n^{th} level, and the tree order $<$ satisfies $y < z$ iff $y = \pi_m^n(z)$ whenever $m < n$, $y \in X_m$ and $z \in X_n$. Let W_n be the set of all $y \in X_n$ such that $X \cap (\pi_n^\omega)^{-1}\{y\}$ is weird (equivalently, non-scattered). Note that $\bigcup_n W_n$ is a subtree of $\bigcup_n X_n$; equivalently, $\pi_m^n(W_n) \subseteq W_m$ whenever $m < n$.

First, note that if $P \subseteq X$ is closed and not scattered, then $W_n \cap \pi_n^\omega(P) \neq \emptyset$ for each n . To see this, use the fact that P is weird and $\pi_n^\omega(P)$ is not weird, and apply Lemma 2.3 to $\pi_n^\omega \upharpoonright P$.

It follows that $\bigcup_n W_n$ is a perfect tree; that is, if $y \in W_m$, then for some $n > m$, there are more than one $z \in W_n$ such that $\pi_m^n(z) = y$. To see this, let P_0, P_1 be disjoint perfect subsets of $X \cap (\pi_m^\omega)^{-1}\{y\}$, and choose n such that $\pi_n^\omega(P_0) \cap \pi_n^\omega(P_1) = \emptyset$. If $z_\ell \in W_n \cap \pi_n^\omega(P_\ell)$ (for $\ell = 0, 1$), then $z_\ell \in W_n$ and $\pi_m^n(z_\ell) = y$ and $z_0 \neq z_1$.

But now we can choose a Cantor subtree. That is, we can choose finite non-empty $F_n \subseteq W_n$ so that $m < n \rightarrow \pi_m^n(F_n) = F_m$ and for each m , there is an $n > m$ such that $|F_n \cap (\pi_m^n)^{-1}\{y\}| \geq 2$ for all $y \in F_m$. Then $\{x \in X : \forall n [\pi_n^\omega(x) \in F_n]\}$ is homeomorphic to the Cantor set, a contradiction. ☺

In particular, by Lemma 2.2, and the observation that every closed subspace of a compact LOTS is a compact LOTS:

Corollary 2.7 *Suppose that $X \subseteq \prod_{j < \omega} Z_j$, where each Z_j is compact and is either second countable or a LOTS. Then X is not weird.*

We now turn to a proof of Theorem 1.3, which obtains a weird subspace of an uncountable product, $[0, 1]^{\omega_1}$. There are many such constructions in the literature; we follow the specific approach in [2]§4, which uses irreducible projections (see [4] Exercise 3.1.C) to ensure that the space is HS and HL.

2.1 The Construction

We shall get $X = X_{\omega_1} \subseteq [0, 1]^{\omega_1}$ with $X_\alpha = \pi_\alpha^{\omega_1}(X) \subseteq [0, 1]^\alpha$ satisfying:

0. $X_1 = [0, 1]$.
1. X_α is connected whenever $1 \leq \alpha \leq \omega_1$.
2. $\pi_\alpha^\beta : X_\beta \twoheadrightarrow X_\alpha$ is irreducible whenever $1 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq \omega_1$.

In particular, $\pi_1^{\omega_1} : X_{\omega_1} \twoheadrightarrow X_1$ will be irreducible, so X will be separable and have no isolated points. To make X HS, we get P_α and $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ for $1 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ so that:

3. $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ is a countable family of closed subsets of X_α and $P_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$.
4. If $P \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$, then
 - a. $\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1} : (\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1})^{-1}(P) \twoheadrightarrow P$ is irreducible, and
 - b. $(\pi_\alpha^\beta)^{-1}(P) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta$ whenever $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$.

Lemma 2.8 *Requirement (4) implies that $\pi_\alpha^\beta : (\pi_\alpha^\beta)^{-1}(P) \twoheadrightarrow P$ is irreducible for all $\beta \geq \alpha$ whenever $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \omega_1$.*

Proof. Induct on β . ☺

To get X to be HL and HS, we add the next requirement:

5. If $F \subseteq X$ is closed, then $\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1}(F) = P_\alpha$ for some $\alpha < \omega_1$.

Lemma 2.9 *Requirements (4)(5) imply that X is HL and HS.*

Proof. To see that X is HL, use (5) and (4) to see that every closed $F \subseteq X$ is a G_δ : For every closed subset F of X , we have $\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1}(F) = P \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$. Then by irreducibility, $F = (\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1})^{-1}(P)$, so that F is a G_δ . Also by (5), all closed $F \subseteq X$ are separable, so X is HS (since it is HL and hence first countable). ☺

Conditions (0)–(5) are consistent with all π_α^β being homeomorphisms, which would make X homeomorphic to $[0, 1]$. To make X weird, we also choose h_α, p_α , and q_α^n for $n < \omega$ and $0 < \alpha < \omega_1$ so that:

6. $p_\alpha \in X_\alpha$ and $h_\alpha \in C(X_\alpha \setminus \{p_\alpha\}, [0, 1])$ and $X_{\alpha+1} = \overline{h_\alpha}$.
7. $q_\alpha^n \in X_\alpha \setminus \{p_\alpha\}$, and $\langle q_\alpha^n : n \in \omega \rangle \rightarrow p_\alpha$, and all points of $[0, 1]$ are limit points of $\langle h_\alpha(q_\alpha^n) : n \in \omega \rangle$, and $\{p_\alpha\} \times [0, 1] \in \mathcal{P}_{\alpha+1}$.
8. For each $P \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$, either $p_\alpha \notin P$, or $p_\alpha \in P$ and $q_\alpha^n \in P$ for all but finitely many n .

As usual, we identify h_α with its graph, which is a subset of $X_\alpha \times [0, 1]$; we also identify $[0, 1]^\alpha \times [0, 1]$ with $[0, 1]^{\alpha+1}$.

Lemma 2.10 *Requirements (0)(6)(7) imply requirements (1)(2).*

Proof. Induct on α . By (6), $\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1} : X_{\alpha+1} \twoheadrightarrow X_\alpha$ is one-to-one at all points not in $(\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1})^{-1}\{p_\alpha\}$. The first part of (7) implies that $\{p_\alpha\} \times [0, 1] \subseteq X_{\alpha+1}$. ☺

Lemma 2.11 *Requirements (0) – (8) imply that if $P \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$ is connected, then $(\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1})^{-1}(P)$ is connected.*

Proof. By (8), if $P \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$ is connected, then $(\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1})^{-1}(P)$ will also be connected, so now prove that $(\pi_\alpha^\beta)^{-1}(P)$ is connected by induction on $\beta \leq \omega_1$. ☺

To help make X weird we add the requirement:

9. If $F \subseteq X$ is closed and not scattered, then for some $\alpha < \omega_1$, $\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1}(F) = P_\alpha$ and P_α is not scattered and $p_\alpha \in P_\alpha$.

Note that we cannot simply omit (5) in favor of (9), since Lemma 2.9 uses (5) for all closed F , including singletons.

Lemma 2.12 *Requirements (0) – (9) imply that X is weird.*

Proof. By (9), every closed non-scattered $F \subseteq X$ satisfies $\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1}(F) = P_\alpha$, for some $\alpha < \omega_1$, with P_α not scattered and $p_\alpha \in P_\alpha$. Such F therefore contain $(\pi_{\alpha+1}^{\omega_1})^{-1}(\{p_\alpha\} \times [0, 1])$. By (7) and Lemma 2.11, each $(\pi_{\alpha+1}^{\omega_1})^{-1}(\{p_\alpha\} \times [0, 1])$ is a connected subspace of X . ☺

Proof of Theorem 1.3. To get (5) and (9), use $\diamond$ to capture all closed subsets of $[0, 1]^{\omega_1}$. To get (7)(8) for a fixed α : First, list $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ as $\{Q^n : n \in \omega\}$, with $Q^0 = P_\alpha$. Let d be a metric on X_α . Choose perfect $F^n \subseteq X_\alpha$ for $n \in \omega$ so that $\text{diam}(F^n) \leq 2^{-n}$ and each $F^{n+1} \subsetneq F^n$. Let $\{p_\alpha\} = \bigcap_n F^n$ and let q_α^n be any point in $F^{n+1} \setminus F^n$. Make sure that $F^0 \subseteq Q^0 = P_\alpha$ whenever P_α is uncountable, so that $p_\alpha \in P_\alpha$ is as required by (9). Also make sure that for every n , either $F^n \subseteq Q^n$ or $F^n \cap Q^n = \emptyset$, so that (8) will hold. ☺

3 Peak Sets

Fix $\alpha < \omega_1$. The function h_α occurring in the proof of Theorem 1.3 is easy to construct because X_α is a compact metric space. Note that there are also uniformly bounded $g_{\alpha,n} \in C(X_\alpha)$ (for $n \in \omega$) with $g_{\alpha,n}(x) \rightarrow h_\alpha(x)$ whenever $x \neq p_\alpha$. In the proof of Theorem 1.6, we shall furthermore require that each $g_{\alpha,n} \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$, where $\mathcal{A}_\alpha \subseteq C(X_\alpha)$. This is not always possible. For example, if $X_\alpha = \overline{D}$ and $\mathcal{A}_\alpha = \mathfrak{D}$, the disc algebra, then we could not find such $g_{\alpha,n}$ and h_α unless $p_\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$, since h_α is required to be discontinuous at p_α . For $\alpha = 1$, we shall avoid this problem by defining X_1 to be $\mathbb{T}$; then a suitable h_1 can be concocted using standard facts about H^∞ (see [6, 8, 11, 14]). To obtain suitable h_α on X_α for $\alpha > 1$, we shall require that all points of X_α be peak points; the following is easily seen to be equivalent to the usual definition (see, e.g., [5]):

Definition 3.1 Assume that X is compact, $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq C(X)$, and H is a closed subset of X . Then H is a peak set (with respect to $\mathcal{A}$) iff there is an $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

1. $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in H$.
2. $\Re(f(x)) > 0$ for all $x \notin H$.

$\mathcal{PS}_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$ is the set of all $H \subseteq X$ which are peak sets with respect to $\mathcal{A}$. $p \in X$ is a peak point iff $\{p\}$ is a peak set.

Every peak set is a closed G_δ set, but not conversely. For example, if H is clopen and $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq C(X)$, then by Runge's Theorem, H is a peak set iff $\chi_H \in \mathcal{A}$. Also, for the disc algebra, $p \in \overline{D}$ is a peak point iff $|p| = 1$.

Our primary interest here is in the peak *points*. However, we mention peak *sets* because these will be used to prove that $\mathcal{PS}_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$ contains singletons by applying the following well-known fact:

Lemma 3.2 If $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq C(X)$, then $\mathcal{PS}_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$ is closed under countable intersections and finite unions.

Proof. For intersections, fix $H_n \in \mathcal{PS}_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$ for $n \in \omega$, and let $H = \bigcap_n H_n$. Let f_n satisfy (1)(2) of Definition 3.1 for H_n , and assume that $\|f_n\| \leq 2^{-n}$. Let $f = \sum_n f_n$. Then $f \in \mathcal{A}$ because $\mathcal{A}$ is closed, and f satisfies (1)(2) for H .

For unions, let $H = H_0 \cup H_1$, and let f_0, f_1 satisfy (1)(2) of Definition 3.1 for H_0, H_1 respectively. Define $f(x) = \sqrt{f_0(x)}\sqrt{f_1(x)}$. Again, $f \in \mathcal{A}$ because $\mathcal{A}$ is closed, since $\sqrt{z}$ can be uniformly approximated by polynomials on any compact subset of $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(z) \geq 0\}$, and f satisfies (1)(2) for H . ☺

Lemma 3.3 Assume that X is compact, $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq C(X)$, and $p \in X$ is a peak point. Let $\langle q_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be a sequence of points in $X \setminus \{p\}$ converging to p . Then there are functions h and g_n for $n \in \omega$ such that:

1. Each $g_n \in \mathcal{A}$.
2. Each $\|g_n\| \leq 1$.
3. $h \in C(X \setminus \{p\}, \overline{D})$.
4. On $X \setminus \{p\}$, the g_n converge to h uniformly on compact sets.
5. $|h(x)| \rightarrow 1$ as $x \rightarrow p$ in $X \setminus \{p\}$.
6. Every $w \in \mathbb{T}$ is a limit point of the sequence $\langle h(q_n) : n \in \omega \rangle$.

Proof. Let f_0 be the function given by Definition 3.1. We plan to obtain h by composing f_0 with a suitable Blaschke product. The notation will be easier if we define the product in the upper halfplane; see, e.g., [6], §II.2. Let

$$V = \{x + iy \in \mathbb{C} : 0 < -x < y\} .$$

If $f(z) = e^{5\pi i/8} \cdot \sqrt[4]{f_0(z)}$, then $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $f(p) = 0$, and $f(x) \in V$ for all $x \neq p$. When $\Im(\alpha) > 0$, let

$$B_\alpha(z) = \frac{z - \alpha}{z - \bar{\alpha}} .$$

Then $|B_\alpha(z)|$ is 1 on the real axis and less than 1 in the upper halfplane. Let $z_\ell = f(q_\ell) \in V$; then $z_\ell \rightarrow 0$. We shall choose α_n in the upper halfplane and form the Blaschke products:

$$B^{(n)}(z) = \prod_{m < n} B_{\alpha_m}(z) \quad B(z) = \prod_{n \in \omega} B_{\alpha_n}(z)$$

They will satisfy:

- a. $B^{(n)}(z) \rightarrow B(z)$ uniformly on compact subsets of V .
- b. $|B(z)| \rightarrow 1$ as $z \rightarrow 0$ in V .
- c. Every point in $\mathbb{T}$ is a limit point of the sequence $\langle B(z_\ell) : \ell \in \omega \rangle$.

Assuming that this can be done, the lemma is satisfied by letting $g_n = B^{(n)} \circ f$ and $h = B \circ f$. $g_n \in \mathcal{A}$ because each $B^{(n)}$ is holomorphic in a convex neighborhood of $f(X)$, and hence can be uniformly approximated on $f(X)$ by polynomials.

To obtain (a)(b)(c), we choose the α_n , along with a subsequence, $\langle z_{\ell_n} : n \in \omega \rangle$, of $\langle z_\ell : \ell \in \omega \rangle$, to satisfy:

- d. $\alpha_n = \xi_n + i\eta_n$ and $0 < \xi_n = (n+1)\eta_n$.
- e. $z_{\ell_n} = x_n + iy_n$ and $\eta_n = y_n$.
- f. $n > m \Rightarrow \xi_n \leq 2^{-n}\eta_m$.
- g. $n > m \Rightarrow |1 - \arg(B_{\alpha_m}(z_{\ell_n})) / \arg(B_{\alpha_m}(0))| \leq 2^{-n}$.

So, α_n is to the right of V and $\xi_0 \geq \eta_0 \geq \xi_1 \geq \eta_1 \geq \xi_2 \geq \eta_2 \geq \dots$. The α_n and z_{ℓ_n} can easily be chosen by induction to satisfy (d)(e)(f)(g), using $z_\ell \rightarrow 0$ and the continuity of B_{α_m} at 0. We now verify (a)(b)(c). Observe that $\eta_n/\xi_n \rightarrow 0$ but $\sum_n \eta_n/\xi_n = \infty$; this will allow us to prove (b) without having $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} B(z)$ exist, which would contradict (c).

For (a), note that if $\alpha = \xi + i\eta$ and $z = x + iy$ then

$$B_\alpha(z) = \frac{x - \xi + iy - i\eta}{x - \xi + iy + i\eta} = 1 - \frac{2i\eta}{x - \xi + iy + i\eta} .$$

Then, as usual with Blaschke products, (a) follows from $\sum_n \eta_n < \infty$, which in turn follows from (d)(f).

For (b), we need to estimate $|B_\alpha(z)|$, where $\alpha = \xi + i\eta$, $z = x + iy \in V$, and $0 < \eta \leq \xi$. Now

$$|B_\alpha(z)|^2 = \frac{(\xi - x)^2 + (y - \eta)^2}{(\xi - x)^2 + (y + \eta)^2} = 1 - \frac{4y\eta}{(\xi - x)^2 + (y + \eta)^2}.$$

Clearly,

$$1 > |B_\alpha(z)|^2 \geq 1 - \frac{4\eta}{y} \quad 1 > |B_\alpha(z)|^2 \geq 1 - \frac{4y}{\eta}, \quad (*)$$

and these are useful when $\eta \ll y$ or $y \ll \eta$. But also note that:

$$1 > |B_\alpha(z)|^2 \geq 1 - \frac{4\eta}{\xi}. \quad (\dagger)$$

To prove this: If $y \geq \xi$ then $(\dagger)$ follows from $(*)$. If $y \leq \xi$ then, since $x \leq 0$, $|B_\alpha(z)|^2 \geq 1 - (4y\eta)/(\xi^2) \geq 1 - (4\eta)/\xi$.

To prove (b), fix $z = x + iy \in V$ with $y \leq \eta_1$. Next fix $n \geq 1$ such that $\eta_{n+1} \leq y \leq \eta_n$. We show that $|B(z)| = 1 - o(1)$ as $n \nearrow \infty$ by estimating each $|B_{\alpha_m}(z)|^2$. Applying $(\dagger)$ and (d), we get $|B_{\alpha_n}(z)|^2 \geq 1 - 4\eta_n/\xi_n = 1 - 4/(n+1)$, and likewise $|B_{\alpha_{n+1}}(z)|^2 \geq 1 - 4/(n+2)$. For $m < n$ use $(*)$ and (d)(f) to get

$$1 > |B_{\alpha_m}(z)|^2 \geq 1 - \frac{4y}{\eta_m} \geq 1 - \frac{4\eta_n}{\eta_m} = 1 - \frac{4\xi_n}{(n+1)\eta_m} \geq 1 - \frac{4 \cdot 2^{-n}}{n+1},$$

so $\prod_{m < n} |B_{\alpha_m}(z)|^2 \geq 1 - 4 \cdot 2^{-n}$. For $m > n+1$ use $(*)$ and (d)(f) to get

$$1 > |B_{\alpha_m}(z)|^2 \geq 1 - \frac{4\eta_m}{y} \geq 1 - \frac{4\eta_m}{\eta_{n+1}} \geq 1 - 4 \cdot 2^{-m},$$

so $\prod_{m > n+1} |B_{\alpha_m}(z)|^2 \geq 1 - 2^{-n+1}$. Putting these estimates together, we get $|B(z)| = 1 - o(1)$.

To verify (c), note that (b) implies that (c) is equivalent to the assertion that $\{\arg(B(z_{\ell_n})) : n \in \omega\}$ is dense in $\mathbb{T}$. We estimate $\arg(B(z))$, using:

$$\arg(B_\alpha(z)) = \arctan \frac{\eta - y}{\xi - x} + \arctan \frac{\eta + y}{\xi - x} = \arctan \frac{2\eta(\xi - x)}{(\xi - x)^2 + y^2 - \eta^2}.$$

We are using $\arctan(u) + \arctan(v) = \arctan((u+v)/(1-uv))$; this applies here because all three of $\arg(\alpha - z)$, $\arg(\bar{\alpha} - z)$, and $\arg(B_\alpha(z))$ are in the range $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$. Let $\theta_n^m = \arg(B_{\alpha_m}(z_{\ell_n}))$. Then $\arg(B(z_{\ell_n})) \equiv \sum_m \theta_n^m \pmod{2\pi}$. Define:

$$\sigma^m := \arg(B_{\alpha_m}(0)) = 2 \arctan \frac{\eta_m}{\xi_m} = 2 \arctan \frac{1}{(m+1)},$$

and observe that we have:

1. $0 < \sigma^m \rightarrow 0$ and $\sum_m \sigma^m = \infty$.
2. $\theta_n^n \rightarrow 0$.
3. $\sum_{m>n} |\theta_n^m| \leq 2^{-n+2}$.
4. $m < n \Rightarrow \sigma^m(1 - 2^{-n}) \leq \theta_n^m \leq \sigma^m(1 + 2^{-n})$.

(1) holds because $\sigma^m \approx 2/m$. (2) follows from (e) and $x_n \leq 0$, which yields

$$\theta_n^n = \arctan \frac{2\eta_n}{\xi_n - x_n} = \arctan \frac{2\eta_n}{(n+1)\eta_n - x_n} \leq \arctan \frac{2\eta_n}{(n+1)\eta_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

For (3), use (d)(f) to get, for $m > n$:

$$|\theta_n^m| = \arctan \frac{2\eta_m|\xi_m - x_n|}{(\xi_m - x_n)^2 + \eta_n^2 - \eta_m^2} \leq \arctan \frac{4\eta_m\eta_n}{\eta_n^2} \leq \frac{4\xi_m}{(m+1)\eta_n} \leq 4 \cdot 2^{-m},$$

so that $\sum_{m>n} |\theta_n^m| \leq 4 \cdot 2^{-n}$. (4) is immediate from (g).

Finally, (1) implies that the values $\sum_{m<n} \sigma_m \bmod 2\pi$ (for $n \in \omega$) are dense in $\mathbb{T}$, and (2)(3)(4) imply that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, these values get close to $\arg(B(z_{\ell_n}))$. ☺

We remark that there are well-known interpolation theorems of Pick, Nevanlinna, Carleson, and others (see [6, 8, 11]) which involve constructing Blaschke products to have given values on a given sequence of points. However, because of our requirement (b) in the above proof, we do not see how to obtain our Blaschke product simply by quoting one of these theorems.

4 Subspaces of Polydiscs

We now return to the construction of §2.1, and show how to modify the space so that it also fails the CSWP. To get a function algebra witnessing this failure, it is easier to construct the space in $\overline{D}^{\omega_1}$ rather than $[0, 1]^{\omega_1}$, so we start by replacing $[0, 1]$ with $\overline{D}$ in the requirements of §2.1.

We shall get $X = X_{\omega_1} \subseteq \overline{D}^{\omega_1}$, with $X_\alpha = \pi_\alpha^{\omega_1}(X) \subseteq \overline{D}^\alpha$. Let REQ^- denote the requirements consisting of conditions (1)–(5) and (8)–(9) of §2.1 plus:

- $\widetilde{0}$. $X_1 = \mathbb{T}$.
- $\widetilde{6}$. $p_\alpha \in X_\alpha$ and $h_\alpha \in C(X_\alpha \setminus \{p_\alpha\}, \overline{D})$ and $X_{\alpha+1} = \overline{h_\alpha}$.
- $\widetilde{7}$. $q_\alpha^n \in X_\alpha \setminus \{p_\alpha\}$, and $\langle q_\alpha^n : n \in \omega \rangle \rightarrow p_\alpha$, and all points of $\mathbb{T}$ are limit points of $\langle h_\alpha(q_\alpha^n) : n \in \omega \rangle$, and $|h_\alpha(x)| \rightarrow 1$ as $x \rightarrow p_\alpha$ in $X_\alpha \setminus \{p_\alpha\}$, and $\{p_\alpha\} \times \mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{P}_{\alpha+1}$.

Note that we have the slice $\{z \in \overline{D} : (p_\alpha, z) \in X_{\alpha+1}\}$ equal to $\mathbb{T}$, not $\overline{D}$, as one might expect. This will enable us to prove that all points in each X_β are peak points; see Lemma 4.5. Since $\mathbb{T}$ is connected, the argument is essentially unchanged, and we get a weird HL space as before, using $\diamond$.

Along with the X_α , we need a function algebra on X_α refuting the CSWP. We use the obvious analog of the disc algebra:

Definition 4.1 $\mathfrak{P}_\alpha \subseteq C(\overline{D}^\alpha)$ is the algebra generated by the projections $\{\varphi_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$ (see Definition 2.5), and $\mathfrak{D}_\alpha \subseteq C(\overline{D}^\alpha)$ is the uniform closure of $\mathfrak{P}_\alpha$. Let $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ be the uniform closure of $\mathfrak{P}_\alpha|_{X_\alpha} = \{f|_{X_\alpha} : f \in \mathfrak{P}_\alpha\}$

For finite α , $\mathfrak{P}_\alpha$ is the algebra of polynomials in α complex variables on the polydisc $\overline{D}^\alpha$, and $\mathfrak{D}_\alpha$ is the algebra of continuous functions which are holomorphic in the interior of the polydisc. For all $\alpha > 0$, $\mathfrak{D}_\alpha \neq C(\overline{D}^\alpha)$. In constructing the X_α , we also make sure that $\mathcal{A}_\alpha \neq C(X_\alpha)$. To do this, we choose all h_α in H^∞ . More precisely:

Definition 4.2 Let $\lambda = \lambda_1$ be the Haar probability measure on $X_1 = \mathbb{T}$. For $1 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$, let λ_α be the unique Borel probability measure on X_α such that λ_1 is the induced measure $\lambda_\alpha(\pi_1^\alpha)^{-1}$. For $1 \leq \alpha \leq \beta < \omega_1$, define the map $(\pi_\alpha^\beta)^* : L^\infty(X_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha) \rightarrow L^\infty(X_\beta, \lambda_\beta)$ by $(\pi_\alpha^\beta)^*([f]) = [f \circ \pi_\alpha^\beta]$, where $[g] \in L^\infty$ denotes the equivalence class of g .

Note that each λ_α is unique because all points in X_1 outside the countable $\{\pi_1^\xi(p_\xi) : 1 \leq \xi < \alpha\}$ have a unique preimage under π_1^α . Likewise, $(\pi_\alpha^\beta)^*$ is a Banach algebra isomorphism.

Let REQ consist of the requirements of REQ^- , along with this requirement on the h_α :

$\widetilde{10}$. For $1 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$, $[h_\alpha] \in (\pi_1^\alpha)^*(H^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$.

This makes X fail the CSWP. Requirement $(\widetilde{10})$ is used explicitly in the proof of the next lemma. Lemma 4.4 follows, and produces a continuous function not in $\mathcal{A}_{\omega_1}$.

Lemma 4.3 Fix β with $1 \leq \beta < \omega_1$. Suppose requirement $(\widetilde{10})$ holds for all $\alpha < \beta$. Then $[k] \in (\pi_1^\beta)^*(H^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$ for each $k \in \mathcal{A}_\beta$.

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{P}_\beta|_{X_\beta}$ is generated by $\{\varphi_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\}$, it suffices to prove that each $[\varphi_\alpha] \in (\pi_1^\beta)^*(H^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$. Now, $[\varphi_0] = (\pi_1^\beta)^*([I])$, where $I(z) = z$. For $1 \leq \alpha < \beta$, $[\varphi_\alpha] = (\pi_\alpha^\beta)^*([h_\alpha]) = [h_\alpha \circ \pi_\alpha^\beta]$. By (10) for $\alpha < \beta$, $[h_\alpha] = [h \circ \pi_1^\alpha]$ for some $h \in H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. So $[\varphi_\alpha] = [h \circ (\pi_1^\alpha \circ \pi_\alpha^\beta)] \in (\pi_1^\beta)^*(H^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$. $\odot$

Lemma 4.4 *Suppose requirements REQ hold. Then $\mathcal{A}_{\omega_1} \neq C(X)$.*

Proof. Let $\bar{I} \in C(X_1)$ denote the usual complex conjugation given by $\bar{I}(z) = \bar{z}$. Then $\bar{I} \circ \pi_1^{\omega_1}$ (i.e., $\bar{z} \mapsto \overline{z_0}$) is not in $\mathcal{A}_{\omega_1}$. To see this: it suffices to show that $\bar{I} \circ \pi_1^\beta \notin \mathcal{A}_\beta$ for all $\beta < \omega_1$. Since $\bar{I} \notin H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, $(\pi_1^\beta)^*([\bar{I}]) \notin (\pi_1^\beta)^*(H^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$ for all $\beta < \omega_1$. So the result follows from Lemma 4.3. $\odot$

Lemma 4.5 *Fix β with $1 \leq \beta < \omega_1$. Suppose requirement $(\tilde{10})$ holds for all $\alpha < \beta$. Then each $y \in X_\beta$ is a peak point with respect to $\mathcal{A}_\beta$.*

Proof. We induct on β . For $\beta = 1$, this is clear, since $X_1 = \mathbb{T}$.

If β is a limit, then $\{y\} = \bigcap_{\alpha < \beta} (\pi_\alpha^\beta)^{-1}\{(\pi_\alpha^\beta)(y)\}$. Applying the lemma inductively, each $(\pi_\alpha^\beta)(y)$ is a peak point in X_α with respect to $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$, which implies that each $(\pi_\alpha^\beta)^{-1}\{(\pi_\alpha^\beta)(y)\}$ is a peak set in X_β with respect to $\mathcal{A}_\beta$. The result now follows using Lemma 3.2.

Now, say $\beta = \alpha + 1$, let $v = \pi_\alpha^\beta(y)$ and let $H = (\pi_\alpha^\beta)^{-1}\{v\}$, which, as above, is a peak set in X_β . If $v \neq p_\alpha$, then $H = \{y\}$. If $v = p_\alpha$, then $y \in H = \{v\} \times \mathbb{T}$ (using condition $(\tilde{7})$). If $y = (v, e^{i\theta})$, then $K = \{x \in X_\beta : \varphi_\alpha(x) = e^{i\theta}\}$ is also a peak set, and $\{y\} = H \cap K$. $\odot$

Proof of Theorem 1.6. We need to show inductively that requirements REQ can indeed be met. Suppose that we have constructed X_β so that they hold for all $\alpha < \beta$. Get $p_\beta \in X_\beta$ and $\langle q_\beta^n : n \in \omega \rangle$ converging to p_β as in the proof of Theorem 1.3. By Lemma 4.5, p_β is a peak point. Now get $h \in C(X_\beta \setminus \{p_\beta\}, \overline{\mathbb{D}})$ and $g_n \in \mathcal{A}_\beta$ as in Lemma 3.3. Then each $[g_n] \in (\pi_1^\beta)^*(H^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$ by Lemma 4.3, so $[h] \in (\pi_1^\beta)^*(H^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$ since $g_n \rightarrow h$ on $X_\beta \setminus \{p_\beta\}$. Thus, taking $h_\beta = h$ satisfies $(\tilde{10})$ for β . Lemma 3.3 also guarantees that this choice of h_β will satisfy the rest of $(\tilde{7})$. The remaining requirements are satisfied as for Theorem 1.3. $\odot$

5 Some Forcing Orders

Definition 5.1 *Order $2^{<\omega_1}$ by: $p \leq q$ iff $p \supseteq q$. Let $\mathbb{1} = \emptyset$, the empty sequence.*

So, $2^{<\omega_1}$ is a tree, with the root $\mathbb{1}$ at the top. Viewed as a forcing order, it is equivalent to countable partial functions from ω_1 to 2. This forcing is countably closed, and thus preserves all witnesses to $\diamond$, and thus preserves the weird space constructed in the proof of Theorem 1.3. To kill such spaces, we shall force with subtrees of $2^{<\omega_1}$ which satisfy a weakening of countable closure.

Definition 5.2 A Cantor tree of sequences is a subset $\{p_s : s \in 2^{<\omega}\} \subseteq 2^{<\omega_1}$ such that each $p_{s \smallfrown \mu} < p_s$ for $\mu = 0, 1$, and $p_{s \smallfrown 0} \perp p_{s \smallfrown 1}$.

That is, $p_{s \smallfrown 0}$ and $p_{s \smallfrown 1}$ are incompatible extensions of p_s .

Definition 5.3 $\mathbb{P} \subseteq 2^{<\omega_1}$ has the Cantor tree property iff:

1. $1 \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}$ is a subtree: $q \geq p \in \mathbb{P} \rightarrow q \in \mathbb{P}$.
2. If $p \in \mathbb{P}$ then $p \smallfrown 0, p \smallfrown 1 \in \mathbb{P}$.
3. Whenever $\{p_s : s \in 2^{<\omega}\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a Cantor tree of sequences, there is at least one $f \in 2^\omega$ such that $\bigcup \{p_{f \upharpoonright n} : n \in \omega\} \in \mathbb{P}$.

Of course, then by (3) there must be uncountably many such f ; in fact the set of f satisfying (3) must meet every perfect subset of the Cantor set 2^ω , since otherwise we could find a subtree of the given Cantor tree which contradicts the Cantor tree property. It is also easily seen by induction that $\mathbb{P}$ is a normal subtree; i.e.:

Lemma 5.4 If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq 2^{<\omega_1}$ has the Cantor tree property, then whenever $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\text{dom}(p) < \alpha < \omega_1$, there is a $q \in \mathbb{P} \cap 2^\alpha$ such that $q < p$.

If $\mathbb{P}$ has the Cantor tree property, then it is proper and forcing with it adds no ω -sequences. Such orders are called *totally proper*; see Eisworth and Roitman [3], which gives a number of equivalents, which we use in:

Lemma 5.5 If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq 2^{<\omega_1}$ has the Cantor tree property, then $\mathbb{P}$ is totally proper.

Proof. Fix a suitably larger regular cardinal, and let $M \prec H(\theta)$ be countable and fix $p \in \mathbb{P} \cap M$. Following [3], it is sufficient to find a $q \leq p$ such that whenever $A \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a maximal antichain and $A \in M$, there is an $r \in A \cap M$ with $q \leq r$.

To get q , let $\{A_n : n \in \omega\}$ list all the maximal antichains which are in M , and build a Cantor tree $\{p_s : s \in 2^{<\omega}\} \subseteq \mathbb{P} \cap M$ such that $p_\emptyset \leq p$ and p_s extends an element of $A_n \cap M$ for each $s \in 2^n$. Then choose $f \in 2^\omega$ such that $q := \bigcup \{p_{f \upharpoonright n} : n \in \omega\} \in \mathbb{P}$. ☺

Thus, assuming PFA, this $\mathbb{P}$ will have an uncountable chain. By Lemma 5.7, a weird space will yield such a $\mathbb{P}$, and hence cannot be HL under PFA.

Lemma 5.6 If X is compact, connected, and infinite, and $U \subseteq X$ is a nonempty open set, then there is a closed $K \subseteq U$ such that K is connected and infinite.

Proof. Let V be open and nonempty with $\overline{V} \subseteq U$, fix $p \in V$, and let $K = \text{comp}(p, \overline{V})$. If $K = \{p\}$, then there is an H which is relatively clopen in $\overline{V}$ such that $H \subseteq V$. But then H would be clopen in X , a contradiction. ☺

Lemma 5.7 *Assume that X is compact, HL, and not totally disconnected, and assume that X has no subspace homeomorphic to the Cantor set 2^ω . Then there exists a $\mathbb{P}$ with the Cantor tree property which has no uncountable chains.*

Proof. Along with $\mathbb{P}$, we shall choose sets H_p for $p \in \mathbb{P}$ with the following properties:

1. H_p is an infinite closed connected subset of X .
2. If $p \in \mathbb{P}$, then $p \smallfrown 0, p \smallfrown 1 \in \mathbb{P}$ and $H_{p \smallfrown 0}, H_{p \smallfrown 1}$ are disjoint subsets of H_p .
3. If $p \in 2^\gamma$, where γ is a countable limit ordinal and $p \restriction \alpha \in \mathbb{P}$ for all $\alpha < \gamma$, then $H_p = \bigcap \{H_{p \restriction \alpha} : \alpha < \gamma\}$, and $p \in \mathbb{P}$ iff H_p is infinite.

$H_{\mathbb{1}}$ can be chosen because X is not totally disconnected. Given $p \in \mathbb{P}$, we can choose $H_{p \smallfrown 0}, H_{p \smallfrown 1}$ by applying Lemma 5.6 to H_p . To verify the Cantor tree property, let $\{p_s : s \in 2^{<\omega}\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ be a Cantor tree of sequences. For $f \in 2^\omega$, let $p_f = \bigcup \{p_f \restriction n : n \in \omega\}$. If none of these p_f are in $\mathbb{P}$, then each H_{p_f} would be a singleton, $\{x_f\}$. But then $\{x_f : f \in 2^\omega\}$ is homeomorphic to the Cantor set. ☺

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Lemmas 5.5 and 5.7. ☺

References

- [1] P. Alexandroff and P. Urysohn, Mémoire sur les espaces topologiques compacts, *Verh. Akad. Wetensch. Amsterdam* 14 (1929) 1-96.
- [2] M. Džamonja and K. Kunen, Measures on compact HS spaces, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 143 (1993) 41 - 54.
- [3] T. Eisworth and J. Roitman, CH with no Ostaszewski spaces, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 351 (1999) 2675 - 2693.
- [4] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Revised Edition, Heldermann Verlag, 1989.
- [5] T. W. Gamelin, *Uniform Algebras*, Second Edition, Chelsea Publishing Company, 1984.
- [6] J. B. Garnett, *Bounded Analytic Functions*, Academic Press, 1981.
- [7] J. Hart and K. Kunen, Complex function algebras and removable spaces, to appear, *Topology and Applications*.

- [8] K. Hoffman, *Banach Spaces of Analytic Functions*, Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- [9] K. Hoffman and I. M. Singer, Maximal algebras of continuous functions, *Acta Math.* 103 (1960) 217-241.
- [10] K. Kunen, The complex Stone–Weierstrass property, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 182 (2004) 151 - 167.
- [11] M. Rosenblum and J. Rovnyak, *Hardy Classes and Operator Theory*, Dover Publications, 1997.
- [12] W. Rudin, Subalgebras of spaces of continuous functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 7 (1956) 825-830.
- [13] W. Rudin, Continuous functions on compact spaces without perfect subsets, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 8 (1956) 39-42.
- [14] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, Third edition. McGraw-Hill, 1987.